

Dated: April 30, 2012



*Eileen W. Hollowell*

Eileen W. Hollowell, Bankruptcy Judge

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

In re:	)	Chapter 11
	)	
West Speedway Phase II, LLC,	)	Case No. 4:09-bk-15664-EWH
	)	
	)	<b>AMENDED *</b>
	)	<b>MEMORANDUM DECISION</b>
	)	<b>REGARDING NATURAL GAS</b>
Debtor.	)	<b>IMPROVEMENT</b>

**I. INTRODUCTION**

There are beautiful saguaro studded hills on the west side of Tucson. That is where the Enclaves at Gates Pass is located—a subdivision (“Subdivision”) where development was to occur in two phases. Phase I (“Phase I”) was developed first and consisted of approximately 21 custom home lots. Most of those lots were sold between 2004 and 2006, despite the fact that the Subdivision’s improvements were incomplete—making it impossible for the purchasers of the lots (“Lot Owners”) to build their houses. Since 2006, there have been two different bankruptcies involving the Subdivision. In 2008, the first developer, West Speedway Partners (“WSI”), as part of its Chapter 11 plan of reorganization,

\* An Amended Memorandum is being issued to correct numerous typographical errors in the original. The substance of the decision remains unchanged.

1 transferred the unsold portions of the Subdivision ("Real Property") to West Speedway  
2 Partners II ("WSII"). In 2009, after WSII's expected financing collapsed, it too filed for  
3 Chapter 11. Since then, litigation has been filed and dismissed in multiple courts.  
4  
5 Deadlines for subdivision reports, various settlement agreements, and bankruptcy court  
6 orders have come and gone. The performance bond ("Bond") issued to assure  
7 completion of improvements in Phase I has been called by Pima County ("County") and,  
8 pursuant to a 2010 settlement agreement ("Settlement Agreement"), released to WSII to  
9 be used exclusively to complete improvements in Phase I. But regulatory approvals  
10 and disputes among the parties have led to one delay after another. Former allies have  
11 become adversaries. Multiple mediations have been held. Conflict continues. This  
12 memorandum addresses one discrete issue: whether WSII must supply natural gas to  
13 all of the lots in Phase I, including lots owned by the Lot Owners ("Lot Owners' Lots").  
14 Perhaps this Court's decision, that WSI's obligation to supply natural gas is solely  
15 contractual and does not include the Lot Owners' Lots, will bring closure and permit the  
16 parties to move forward. Theoretically, anything can happen. For example, one day  
17 pigs may learn how to fly.  
18  
19

## 20 **II. JURISDICTION**

21 All parties to this dispute, other than WSI, have consented in writing to this  
22 Court's jurisdiction. While WSI did not file a consent to jurisdiction, it did file a brief  
23 arguing that WSII is required to provide natural gas to all of Phase I, including the Lot  
24 Owners' Lots. In earlier pleadings, WSI asserted that because the Settlement  
25 Agreement includes a mandatory arbitration clause with a named arbitrator, this Court  
26 lacks jurisdiction to decide any matter addressed in the Settlement Agreement.  
27  
28

1 However, the Lot Owners, one of the parties seeking relief before this Court, are not  
2 parties to the Settlement Agreement, and, therefore, the mandatory arbitration  
3 provisions of that agreement do not apply to them.  
4

5 Furthermore, much of the analysis regarding whether natural gas must be  
6 provided, and to whom, depends on the interpretation of the contract ("Contract") for the  
7 sale of the Real Property from WSI to WSII. The Contract was approved as part of the  
8 confirmation of WSI's Chapter 11 plan. Under Article VII(c) of that plan, this Court  
9 retains jurisdiction over the plan's implementation. Accordingly, jurisdiction over WSI is  
10 proper under the terms of its confirmed plan and over all other parties by consent.  
11

### 12 **III. THE POSITION OF THE PARTIES**

#### 13 **A. WSII**

14 The WSII brief attaches numerous documents to support its argument that:

- 15 (1) no government agency (federal, state, county or city) requires installation  
16 of natural gas;
- 17 (2) no plans or plats require installation of natural gas;
- 18 (3) contracts, permits, and "Property Documents," which were purportedly  
19 assigned from WSI to WSII under the Contract, either expired before the  
20 March 6, 2008 purchase date ("Purchase Date") and/or the contracts,  
21 permits, and Property Documents were never delivered from WSI to WSII.  
22 Included in the "never received" category is any contract or plans with  
23 Southwest Gas;
- 24 (4) a 2004 Subdivision Public Report ("Public Report") issued by the Arizona  
25 Department of Real Estate, which lists Southwest Gas as a utility provider,  
26  
27  
28

- 1 was suspended in 2006 and, therefore, is not binding on WSII because  
2 WSII did not take title to the Real Property until 2008;
- 3 (5) WSII was only assigned purchase agreements ("Assigned Purchase  
4 Agreements") for two lots in Phase I, which were in escrow on the  
5 Purchase Date;  
6
- 7 (6) misrepresentations were made by WSI to WSII regarding the location of a  
8 main gas line;
- 9 (7) the Assigned Purchase Agreements only refer to "gas," not "natural gas";
- 10 (8) the Initial Assurance Agreement (January 7, 2004) and Substitute  
11 Assurance Agreements (December 2, 2004) issued with respect to  
12 Phase I limits improvements to what is called for in the Subdivision plat,  
13 which does not require natural gas;  
14
- 15 (9) a Release of the Subdivision Assurance Trust (December 14, 2004),  
16 which permitted WSI to substitute the Bond for holding title to the  
17 Subdivision in a trust, does not require delivery of natural gas;  
18
- 19 (10) the costs of providing natural gas is prohibitive;
- 20 (11) there is no loss in value to the Lot Owners' Lots if natural gas is not  
21 delivered.

22 B. The Lot Owners

23 The Lot Owners argue that WSII is contractually bound by the Settlement  
24 Agreement to provide natural gas to all of the lots in Phase I because:  
25

- 26 (1) their original purchase agreements with WSI ("Lot Owners' Purchase  
27 Agreements") provided for natural gas;

- 1 (2) the Public Report was part of the Lot Owners' Purchase Agreements and,  
2 because the Public Report includes Southwest Gas as one of the utility  
3 providers, natural gas must be provided to their lots by WSII;  
4  
5 (3) WSII admitted and/or represented that natural gas was required through  
6 statements it made in court and by including natural gas as a line item in  
7 budgets or exhibits filed in its bankruptcy case;  
8  
9 (4) "Original Documents" consisting of the Initial Assurance Agreement,  
10 Substitute Assurance Agreement, Release of Subdivision Assurance  
11 Trust, Final Plat, as well as the Subdivision's Covenants, Conditions &  
12 Restrictions ("CC&Rs"), require WSII to deliver natural gas to all of the lots  
13 in Phase I;  
14  
15 (5) no proposed alternative by WSII is acceptable to the installation of natural  
16 gas .

17 C. WSI

18 WSI argues that WSII must provide natural gas to all of the lots in Phase I  
19 because:

- 20 (1) WSII has made representations in hearings and pleadings indicating that it  
21 understood that natural gas was a required improvement for all lots in  
22 Phase I;  
23  
24 (2) WSII was on notice that natural gas was required because, after the sale,  
25 WSII removed trenches at the Subdivision which included gas lines;  
26  
27 (3) because the CC&Rs prohibit above-ground storage tanks, natural gas  
28 must be provided;

- (4) WSI's principal verbally informed WSII's principal that natural gas was required;
- (5) because the Public Report lists Southwest Gas as a utility provider, natural gas must be provided;
- (6) WSII has submitted budgets and exhibits in its bankruptcy case which include line items for natural gas;
- (7) WSII has misled all parties about what permits it had in order to complete improvements in Phase I;
- (8) WSII cannot confirm a plan of reorganization unless there is an infusion of capital by its principal;
- (9) WSII, as title holder of the Real Property, should pay any costs associated with delivery of natural gas to all lots in Phase I.

D. Pima County

The County has filed a brief indicating:

- (1) the County does not require that a natural gas line be provided to the Subdivision;
- (2) approvals for development of the common area of the Subdivision will not require installation of natural gas to Phase I of the Subdivision.

**IV. ANALYSIS**

In order to decide whether natural gas is required as an improvement and, if so, the scope of that obligation, an analysis must be conducted in four distinct areas:

- (1) Do the terms of the Contract and/or the Settlement Agreement require WSII to deliver natural gas to all or any portion of Phase I?

- 1 (2) Do the agreements assigned to WSII by WSI require WSII to deliver  
2 natural gas to all or any portion of Phase I?  
3  
4 (3) Do certain recorded documents, including plats, assurance agreements,  
5 CC&Rs, and subdivision reports require WSII to deliver natural gas to all  
6 or any portion of Phase I?  
7  
8 (4) Do representations made by WSII and/or other evidence of WSII's  
9 understanding regarding supplying natural gas to the Subdivision require  
10 WSII to provide natural gas to all or any portion of Phase I?

11 A. Contract and Settlement Agreement

12 1. Contract

13 The Contract transferred the Real Property to WSII. The Real Property consists  
14 of three lots (12, 13, and 18) in Phase I ("Phase I Lots"), together with any common  
15 area in the Subdivision and all of Phase II. The purchase price was \$2,720,000–  
16 \$320,000 in cash and \$2,400,000 in the form of a promissory note in favor of WSI,  
17 secured by the Real Property.  
18

19 The Contact required WSI to assign all of its interest in licenses, governmental  
20 approvals, permits, contracts with utility service providers, all "Property Documents"  
21 (surveys, plats, engineering data, etc.), and all trade name and trademarks to WSII  
22 (Contract 3.3 and 4.1). WSI was to deliver to WSII an "Assignment of Declarant's  
23 Rights" including any rights under any CC&Rs (Contract 7.1.3). WSI was also required  
24 to deliver an "Assignment and Assumption Agreement of Purchase Agreements" for  
25 each of the Phase I Lots, including known deposits (Contract 9.6).  
26  
27  
28

1 The January 2008 Order confirming WSI's plan of reorganization and approving  
2 the Contract provides in subparagraph D that WSII could not close sales on any Phase I  
3 Lot until it completed "Phase I Improvements and the County has inspected them and  
4 finds them to be in compliance with the plans." WSI's Confirmation Order states that  
5 Phase I Improvements are defined by 9.4 of the Contract. Section 9.4 of the Contract  
6 defines Phase I Improvements ("Phase I Improvements") as:

8 certain improvements and infrastructure for Phase I  
9 identified by Pima County.

10 Section 9.4 further provides that when the Phase I Improvements are completed,  
11 they must be approved by the County, "any applicable" utility, and any other  
12 governmental authority or agency having jurisdiction over the Real Property.

13 Because the Contract defines Phase I Improvements as improvements and  
14 infrastructure identified by the County, and because the County does not require that  
15 natural gas be provided to the Subdivision, the Contract does not require WSII to  
16 provide natural gas to any lot in Phase I.

## 18 2. Settlement Agreement

19 The Lot Owners are not parties to the Settlement Agreement. Paragraph 15 of  
20 that agreement states that there are no third-party beneficiaries to the Settlement  
21 Agreement. Notwithstanding that provision, the Lot Owners assert that the Settlement  
22 Agreement requires that natural gas be provided to all lots in Phase I.

24 The Settlement Agreement permitted the indemnity company to release the  
25 penal amount of the Bond (\$696,813) to a controlled account to be used exclusively "for  
26 construction of the subdivision improvements on Phase I of the Subdivision" (collectively  
27



1 “Subdivision Phase I Improvements”) (Section B of December 21, 2009 Letter of Intent  
2 incorporated into the Settlement Agreement by paragraph 2 of that agreement). Similar  
3 to the Contract, the Settlement Agreement at Section E prohibits any development of  
4 Phase II until the Subdivision Phase I Improvements are complete.  
5

6 The Settlement Agreement does not specify what improvements are included in  
7 Subdivision Phase I Improvements. Section M is consistent, however, with the  
8 Contract’s definition of Phase I Improvements. Section M provides in relevant part:

9 Upon final completion of the Subdivision Phase I Improvements *to the*  
10 *satisfaction of Pima County*, and upon payment to Capitol (issuer of the  
11 Bond) in the amount of the full extent of its Loss, Capitol will waive,  
12 vacate, rescind or assign and all rights it may have in the Collateral.

13 (emphasis added).

14 Under Section 9.4 of the Contract, Phase I Improvements are those  
15 improvements identified by the County and completed to its satisfaction (and to the  
16 satisfaction of any regulatory authority with jurisdiction over the Subdivision and any  
17 “applicable” utility provider). The Settlement Agreement also requires that Subdivision  
18 Phase I Improvements be satisfactory to the County. The County does not require  
19 delivery of natural gas to the Subdivision. Accordingly, if WSII satisfactorily completes  
20 the improvements in Phase I identified by the County, it will satisfy its obligations under  
21 both the Contract and the Settlement Agreement.  
22

23 Even if the Lot Owners are third-party beneficiaries of the Settlement Agreement,  
24 the result is the same. In order to satisfy its obligations under the Contract and the  
25 Settlement Agreement, WSII must satisfactorily complete the improvements in Phase I  
26 which the County requires.  
27

1 B. Assigned Contracts

2 While the Contract and the Settlement Agreement do not require that WSII  
3 provide natural gas to Phase I of the Subdivision, WSII may still be contractually  
4 obligated to provide natural gas by the terms of various contracts assigned to it under  
5 the Contract. The Lot Owners and WSI argue that the Lot Owners' Purchase  
6 Agreements and an assignment of a purported contract with Southwest Gas require  
7 WSII to provide natural gas to all of the lots in Phase I.  
8

9 (1) Southwest Gas Contract

10 The Lot Owners argue that because WSI and WSII executed an assignment  
11 ("Assignment") to WSII of a purported contract between WSI and Southwest Gas, that  
12 the Lot Owners, as third-party beneficiaries of the Assignment, may require WSII to  
13 deliver natural gas to all of the lots in Phase I.  
14

15 WSII asserts that no contract between WSI and Southwest Gas exists because  
16 WSI never delivered any contract to WSII as required by Sections 3.3 and 4.1 of the  
17 Contract. Notably, no contract between WSI and Southwest Gas has been submitted in  
18 the Lot Owners' or WSI's briefs.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, Southwest Gas did not file a proof of  
19 claim in WSI's bankruptcy case, and WSI's schedules do not list Southwest Gas as a  
20 creditor or as a party to an executory contract on Schedule G. WSII could only assign  
21 what it had. If no contract with Southwest Gas exists, the Assignment is a nullity.  
22  
23  
24

---

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> WSI has attached to its brief a 2005 addendum to a contract with Parkhurst  
27 Construction that refers to a "4" gas trunk main." That, however, is not a contract  
28 between WSI and Southwest Gas.

1 Even if a contract between WSI and Southwest Gas exists, it would not change  
2 the Contract's definition of Phase I Improvements or the Settlement Agreement's  
3 definition of Subdivision Phase I Improvements. Any assigned contract with Southwest  
4 Gas is just that—a contract. Contracts can be breached or, if the contract is executory,  
5 rejected by a Chapter 11 debtor.<sup>2</sup> Breach or rejection will give the non-breaching party  
6 a right to damages—nothing more.  
7

8 (2) Purchase Agreements

9 There are at least two Assigned Purchase Agreements for the Phase I Lots.<sup>3</sup>  
10 The Assigned Purchase Agreements list “gas” as an improvement. The Public Report is  
11 attached to those agreements which list Southwest Gas as a utility provider.  
12 Accordingly, the Assigned Purchase Agreements impose a contractual duty on WSII to  
13 provide natural gas, but only as to the Phase I Lots. WSII was not assigned the Lot  
14 Owners' Purchase Agreements under the Contract. Any contractual rights the Lot  
15 Owners—who are fee owners of their lots—have for breach of the Lot Owners' Purchase  
16 Agreements are rights solely against their seller, WSI.<sup>4</sup>  
17  
18  
19  
20

---

21 <sup>2</sup> Any contract to provide utilities will have performance due on both sides and will,  
22 therefore, be executory under 11 U.S.C. § 365.

23 <sup>3</sup> WSII asserts only two of the three Phase I Lots were subject to a pending sale on the  
24 Purchase Date. The analysis is the same, however, whether there were one or three  
Assigned Purchase Agreements.

25 <sup>4</sup> The Lot Owners apparently understand that their contract claims are claims against  
26 WSI since they filed breach of contract claims in WSI's bankruptcy case. They have not  
27 filed such claims in WSII's bankruptcy case.

1 Just as with the purported contract with Southwest Gas, WSII's obligation under  
2 the Assigned Purchase Agreements is contractual. Contracts can be breached or, if  
3 appropriate, rejected—giving the non-breaching party a right to damages. However, so  
4 long as WSII satisfactorily completes the Phase I Improvements identified by the  
5 County, any breach under the Assigned Purchase Agreements will not be a breach of  
6 the Contract or the Settlement Agreement.  
7

8 C. Original Documents

9 The Lot Owners assert that under the Original Documents, WSI was required  
10 to complete improvements, including installing natural gas, and that WSII as the  
11 purchaser of the Real Property is also bound by those documents to provide natural gas  
12 to all of the lots in Phase I. The Original Documents include: the Public Report, Initial  
13 Assurance Agreement, Substitute Assurance Agreement, Release of Subdivision  
14 Assurance Trust, Final Plat, and the CC&Rs.  
15

16 The various assurance agreements have been replaced by the Settlement  
17 Agreement, which released the Bond. For the reasons explained earlier, the Settlement  
18 Agreement does not require natural gas as an improvement. The parties disagree  
19 about whether natural gas is specified as a utility in the Final Plat.<sup>5</sup> The platting  
20 process, however, falls within the County's authority. See A.R.S. § 11-822. Since the  
21 County has indicated that it will not require natural gas as an improvement to the  
22 Subdivision, it is assumed that: (1) there is nothing in the Final Plat which requires  
23  
24  
25

---

26  
27 <sup>5</sup> The copy submitted to the Court in earlier pleadings is illegible.  
28

1 natural gas; or (2) even if there is, compliance with that part of the Final Plat is not  
2 required in order for WSII to obtain the County's approval for the Phase I Improvements.

3         The Lot Owners and WSI assert that because the CC&Rs bar above-ground  
4 tanks, that natural gas must be provided as an improvement. However, the CC&Rs  
5 could restrict above-ground tanks even if the Subdivision were "all electric." The  
6 CC&Rs ban on above-ground tanks does not prove that natural gas is a required  
7 improvement. It just proves that lot owners cannot have above-ground tanks on their  
8 lots.  
9

10         The Lot Owners also assert that WSII, as the successor in interest to WSI, is  
11 bound by the terms of the Public Report which requires natural gas as an improvement.  
12 This argument fails. WSII did not acquire the entire Subdivision, but only the Real  
13 Property which included the Phase I Lots, but not the Lot Owners' Lots. The Public  
14 Report, which WSI allowed to lapse, leading to its revocation in 2006, was in effect  
15 when the Lot Owners closed the purchases of their lots.<sup>6</sup> When improvements were not  
16 completed, the Lot Owners had the right to damages against WSI for breach of the Lot  
17 Owners' Purchase Agreements.  
18  
19

20         It may be that, under Arizona law, WSII is a successor "subdivider" as to the  
21 Phase I Lots it acquired from WSI—a question that need not be reached by this Court.<sup>7</sup>  
22 The Lot Owners have, however, failed to explain how WSII is a successor "subdivider"  
23

---

24 <sup>6</sup> It is unclear how those sales were permitted to close since A.R.S. § 32-2183(F)  
25 prohibits the sale of subdivided property if the property is out of compliance with its  
26 public report.

27 <sup>7</sup> See Alaface v. Nat'l Inv. Co., 181 Ariz. 586, 592, 892 P.2d 1375, 1381 (1994)  
(successor in interest to lots within a subdivision is an owner of subdivided lands).

1 for Lot Owners' Lots that it did not acquire from WSI. If there have been violations of  
2 the Public Report and/or other provisions of Arizona's subdivision laws with respect to  
3 the Lot Owners' Lots, those violations are the responsibility of WSI, not WSII.

4  
5 D. WSII's Representations and Understandings Regarding Natural Gas

6 WSI and WSII spend time in their briefs pointing fingers at each other about  
7 "misrepresentations" and "understandings." Conversations which occurred prior to the  
8 execution of the Contract about whether natural gas was a required improvement are  
9 barred by Section 10.9 of the Contract, which provides that the Contract is the entire  
10 agreement between the parties and can be amended, modified, or supplemented only in  
11 writing. Conversations about the parties' understanding of the definition of Phase I  
12 Improvements are, therefore, parole evidence which cannot be considered unless the  
13 Contract is ambiguous, and it is not. Similarly, Section 5.2 of the Contract bars WSII  
14 from claiming that it should not be bound by the Contract because of alleged  
15 misrepresentations by WSI. WSII was provided with a due diligence period. Thereafter,  
16 it took title to the Real Property "as is."  
17

18 Both the Lot Owners and WSI point out that WSII filed exhibits and cost  
19 estimates that included natural gas as a line item. Exhibit B to the Contract is WSII's  
20 budgeted cost estimates, but that exhibit is not referenced in 9.4 of the Contract where  
21 Phase I Improvements are defined. Instead, it is referenced in 2.1.3, which adjusts the  
22 amount of the note due from WSII to WSI. WSII also prepared two exhibits that  
23 included line items regarding natural gas when it filed a motion seeking approval of the  
24 Settlement Agreement. However, neither of those exhibits were attached to or  
25 incorporated into the Settlement Agreement. At most, the three exhibits indicate that  
26  
27  
28

1 WSII anticipated providing natural gas to some part of the Subdivision, which is not  
2 surprising since natural gas is a required improvement under the Assigned Purchase  
3 Agreements. But whatever WSII may have anticipated or understood, it does not  
4 change the definitions of Phase I Improvements or Phase I Subdivision Improvements  
5 contained in the Contract and the Settlement Agreement.<sup>8</sup>  
6

7 The balance of the “misrepresentation” arguments, especially those made by  
8 WSI, are little more than name calling. The Subdivision has been a mess for years.  
9 Finger pointing and outrage do not shine any light on what improvements must be  
10 provided to Phase I.  
11

## 12 **V. CONCLUSION**

13 The Contract defines Phase I Improvements as being the improvements and  
14 infrastructure identified by the County. The terms of the Settlement Agreement  
15 regarding Subdivision Phase I Improvements are consistent with the Contract’s  
16 definition of Phase I Improvements. Because the County does not require natural gas  
17 as an improvement, WSII has no obligation under the Contract or the Settlement  
18 Agreement to provide natural gas as an improvement. It does have a contractual  
19 obligation to provide natural gas to lots subject to an Assigned Purchase Agreement,  
20 but not to the Lot Owners’ Lots. No evidence has been provided that WSI had a  
21 contract with Southwest Gas to assign to WSII. Even if such a contract existed, it would  
22 not alter the definition of Phase I Improvements.  
23  
24  
25

---

26 <sup>8</sup> Similarly, WSII’s tearing out of trenches at the Subdivision, which included gas lines,  
27 does not alter the terms of the Contract and the Settlement Agreement.  
28

1 Both the Lot Owners and WSII ask for an award of attorneys' fees against each  
2 other. They each also ask the Court to order the other to comply with their suggested  
3 compromise to the "gas problem." Neither side cites any authority that would permit an  
4 award of attorneys' fees in their favor, and the Court is aware of none. Accordingly,  
5 both requests are denied. Similarly, the Court declines to impose any settlement on the  
6 parties. It has been asked to decide a discrete issue and has done so.

8 WSII's Chapter 11 case has been pending since 2009. WSII must now move  
9 forward with its case. A separate order will be entered this date setting a status hearing  
10 on WSII's reorganization plan, which should proceed expeditiously to confirmation or, if  
11 no reorganization is possible, then WSII 's case must either be converted to Chapter 7  
12 or dismissed.

14 Signed and dated above.

17 Notice to be sent through  
18 the Bankruptcy Noticing Center  
"BNC" to the following:

19 Michael W. Baldwin  
20 Law Offices of Michael Baldwin PLC  
5533 E. Pima Street  
21 Tucson, AZ 85712-3703

22 Dennis J. Clancy  
23 Raven Clancy & McDonagh PC  
313 S. Convent  
24 Tucson, AZ 85701

25 Walter F. Wood  
26 1209 N. 4th Ave.  
Tucson, AZ 85705

Neil J. Konigsberg  
Pima County Attorney's Office  
Civil Division  
32 N. Stone Ave., Suite 2100  
Tucson, AZ 85701  
Adam D. Melton  
Mann, Berens & Wisner LLP  
3300 N. Central Ave., Suite 2400  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Christopher J. Pattock  
Office of the U.S. Trustee  
230 N. First Ave. #204  
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1706